

REMARKS

In the above-mentioned, Final Office Action, all of the pending claims, claims 1, 3, 7, 9, 10, 13-20, and 26-28 were rejected. Claims 1, 3, 7, and 9 were rejected under Section 103(a) over Lynch, Ulrich, Chiu, and Daigle. Claim 10 was rejected under Section 103(a) over the combination of Lynch, Ulrich, Chiu, Daigle, and Friend. Claims 13 and 15-17 were rejected under Section 103(a) over the combination of Lynch, Kaplan, Ulrich, and Chiu. Claim 14 was rejected under Section 103(a) over the combination of Lynch, Kaplan, Ulrich, Chiu, and Bucknell. Claim 18 was rejected under Section 103(a) over the combination of Lynch, Kaplan, Ulrich, Chiu, and Friend. Claims 19-20 were rejected under Section 103(a) over the combination of Lynch, Kaplan, Ulrich, Chiu, and Zirnstein. Claim 26 was rejected under Section 103(a) over the combination of Chiu and Daigle. Claim 27 was rejected under Section 103(a) over the combination of Chiu, Daigle, and Bucknell. And, claim 28 was rejected under Section 103(a) over the combination of Chiu, Daigle, Bucknell, and Lynch.

Responsive to the rejections of the claims, the independent claims, the independent claims, claims 1, 13, and 26, have been amended, in manners as set forth herein, believed better to distinguish the invention of the present application over the cited combinations of references used thereagainst.

With respect to claim 1, the recitation of the reconfiguration message generator is amended, now to state that the generator is for generating a reconfiguration message that comprises instructions to make changes to a home-mode configuration file. Independent claims 13 and 26 are analogously amended.

Support for the amended recitation is found in the disclosure, for example, on page 16, lines 15-22, which states that a message is generated for transmission back to a home node,

that a user indicates changes that will be made to an existing configuration file, and that a reconfiguration includes instructions to change settings.

The Applicants assert that the cited references relied upon by the Examiner fail to disclose generation of a reconfiguration message, as now-recited, to include instructions to make changes to a home-node configuration file. Specifically, the Applicants traverse the Examiner's reliance upon Lynch for disclosing a reconfiguration message generator, as now-recited in claim 1, and generation of a reconfiguration message, in the manners as now-recited in claim 13. The Applicants further traverse the Examiner's reliance upon Chiu for disclosing a home node reconfiguration message processor, as now-recited.

In the rejection, the Examiner specifically cited paragraphs [0012], [0015], [0079], and [0081]-[0082] of Lynch for disclosing generation of a reconfiguration message. While paragraph [0081] discloses that email contacts can be copied over from one computer to another, the Applicants assert that this is not the equivalent to generation of a reconfiguration message that comprises instructions to make changes to a home-node configuration file. And, the Applicants assert, therefore, that this portion of Lynch cannot be relied upon for disclosing generation of a reconfiguration message, as now-recited. The other sections relied upon by the Examiner also fail to disclose such reconfiguration message generation.

Additionally, paragraphs [0026]-[0028] of Chiu were cited for showing the reconfiguration message processor recited in claim 26. This cited section of Chiu pertains to a redirection system in which a command message is transmitted by a mobile device to a host system to alter a configuration that is determinative of whether a particular mobile device can receive and process attachments. The Applicants assert, however, that neither this cited section of Chiu, nor others, disclose a reconfiguration message comprising instructions to make changes to a home-node configuration file in a manner to cause reconfiguration of effectuation of disposition of email messages, all as now-recited.

None of the other references were cited for showing, nor appear to show, these amended recitations. The Applicants assert, therefore, that no combination of these other references can be made with Lynch and Chiu to form the recited invention. And, therefore, the Applicants assert that the invention recited in independent claims 1, 13, and 26, as now-presented, are patentably distinguishable over the cited combination used there against.

As the remaining dependent claims include all of the recitations of their respective parent claims, these claims are believed to be patentably distinguishable over the cited combinations of references for the same reasons as those given with respect to their respective parent claims.

Accordingly, in light of the forgoing, independent claims 1, 13, and 26, and the dependent claims dependent thereon, are believed to be in condition for allowance. Re-examination and reconsideration for allowance of the claims is, accordingly, respectfully requested. Such early action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

/ Robert H. Kelly /

Robert H. Kelly,
Reg. No. 33,922

KELLY & KRAUSE, L.P.
6600 LBJ Freeway, Suite 275
Dallas, Texas 75240
Telephone: (214) 446-6684
Fax: (214) 446-6692
robert.kelly@kelly-krause.com